



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/025,570	12/26/2001	Masaru Matsuura	K0103-US/OH	8366
466	7590	08/04/2004	EXAMINER	
YOUNG & THOMPSON 745 SOUTH 23RD STREET 2ND FLOOR ARLINGTON, VA 22202			MADSEN, ROBERT A	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1761	

DATE MAILED: 08/04/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/025,570	MATSUURA ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Robert Madsen	1761

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 June 2004.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-7 and 9-17 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) 1-6 and 10-17 is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 7 and 9 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on June 15, 2004 has been entered. Claims 10-17 were added. Claims 1-7,9-17 remain pending in the application.

Claim Objections

2. Claim 9 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable Sengoku et al. (US 4874630) in view of Uno et al. (JP 61234763).

5. Sengoku et al. teach filling a container with soybean milk and coagulant, sealing the container, heating the sealing container and providing a tofu that can be shaken laterally to break contact between the tofu and the inside of the container surface (See Column 3, lines 4-38, Column 4, lines 10-32, and Example 1 from Column 4, line 38 to Column 5, line 9). However Sengoku et al. are silent in teaching dropping the container as part of the manufacturing process to break contact between the tofu and inside of the container surface, as recited in claim 9.

6. Uno et al. teach an removing a solidified fluid food from a mold by dropping the mold. Uno et al. teach this food is removed easily from the mold. Furthermore, the dropping method of Uno et al. is automated, via a conveyor system (JPO and Derwent Abstracts).

7. Therefore, it would have been obvious to modify Sengoku et al. and include a dropping step to break contact between the tofu and mold container since Uno et al. teach this is an easy method of removing fluid food solidified in a mold, and Uno et al. further teach the advantage of a food removal process which can be automated.

Allowable Subject Matter

8. Claims 1-6,10-17 are allowed.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments, filed June 15, 2004, with respect to Abe and Onishi in light of the amendment have been fully considered and are persuasive. The rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Onishi (JP59175857) and claims 1,3,5 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Abe (US 4147811) have been withdrawn. Consequently, the rejections of claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abe (US 4147811) in view of Matsuura (US 451433), claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abe (US 4147811), and claims 5 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Onishi (JP59175857) in view of Hartz (US 3812210) have also been withdrawn.

10. Applicant's arguments, filed June 15, 2004, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 7 and 9 under 103(a) as being unpatentable over Onishi (JP59175857) in view of Hartz (US 3812210) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground of rejection for claim 7 is made, as set forth above.

Conclusion

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Sordi (EP0124060) teaches shaking cheese molds to break the contact of the cheese with the mold.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert Madsen whose telephone number is (571) 272-1402. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00AM-3:30PM M-F.

13. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Milton Cano can be reached on (571) 272-1398. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

14. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Robert Madsen
Examiner
Art Unit 1761


MILTON I. CANO
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700